UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.8/Rev.1
15 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME
MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

Addendum

CHAPTER VI. EVALUATION

DRAFT DECISION

Evaluation

The Governing Council,

Recalling its decision 92/24 of 26 May 1992 on evaluation,

Also recalling General Assembly resolution 47/199 of 22 December 1992 on the triennial policy review of the operational activities of the United Nations development system and, in particular, paragraph 32 relating to evaluation and monitoring, with its emphasis on output, impact and performance orientation,

Noting the need for the United Nations Development Programme to continue to seek, in cooperation with Governments and United Nations specialized agencies, high levels of efficiency and effectiveness in its activities in national capacity-building and in the delivery of its programmes and projects, through, inter alia, adequate monitoring, reporting and feedback mechanisms,

Also noting the role of the United Nations Development Programme in the coordination of United Nations system evaluation issues through its chairmanship of the Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation,

1. Notes with appreciation the report of the Administrator on evaluation (DP/1993/26), the continuing work of the United Nations Development Programme in the area of evaluation and also takes note of the impending issuance of revised and strengthened guidelines for country programme evaluations;

2. Requests the Administrator to include, as a biennial element in his annual report on evaluation to the Governing Council, a statistical and qualitative analysis of evaluation reports, containing, inter alia, a disaggregated analysis indicating the degree and rate of success or failure in programmes and activities by specific sectors, themes, geographic regions and executing agency provided that the volume of data is sufficient to validate the analysis;

3. Requests the Administrator to report in 1994 on the ongoing study referred to in paragraph 34 of document DP/1993/26 and to include in that report actions and proposals aimed at a strategic approach on feedback throughout the United Nations Development Programme, including at the field level;

4. Requests the Administrator to seek to undertake more joint evaluations, where appropriate, with other United Nations organizations and with Member States, in order to encourage the promotion of common evaluation principles and practices;

5. Urges the Administrator, through, inter alia, the Joint Consultative Group on Policy and the Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation and the participation of the United Nations Development Programme in the Consultative Committee for Programme and Operational Questions to continue to support coordinated action towards a common system of reporting the degree and rate of success or failure in the achievement of programme and project objectives;

6. Requests that a list of evaluations, when completed, be distributed to members and observers of the Governing Council.

UNITED NATIONS

DP

Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.9
14 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR
PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

Addendum

CHAPTER III. COUNTRY, INTERCOUNTRY AND GLOBAL PROGRAMMES

C. Arab States

1. Country programmes

Bahrain

1. The resident Representative introduced the fifth country programme for Bahrain (DP/CP/BAH/5), with resources from cost-sharing by the Government estimated at $10 million. He highlighted three main areas of concentration: economic management through strengthening of planning institutions to prepare a long-term perspective for a diversified economy; protection of the environment and management of natural resources; and the establishment of development strategy for human resources to help implement the policy of Bahrainization.

2. The representative of Bahrain expressed the full support of his Government for the programme, which was prepared with the active participation of the ministries and departments concerned. He also explained the reasons for the delay in the preparation of the country programme and in particular the difficulties arising from the implementation of the net contributor status provisions contained in Governing Council decision 85/16 of 29 June 1985 and the impact of the Gulf crisis on the economies of the region.

3. The Committee recommended that the Governing Council approve the fifth country programme for Bahrain.

Kuwait

4. The Assistant Administrator and Director, Regional Bureau for Arab States (RBAS), introduced the fifth country programme for Kuwait (DP/CP/KUW/5 and Corr.1). The resources were estimated at $15 million, representing 100 per cent cost-sharing. The main areas of concentration were human resources development; development planning and public management; and environment and natural resources management.

5. The representative of Kuwait expressed the importance Kuwait attached to the programme, pointing to the size of the programme compared with the previous one, which had $3.9 million in resources. She asked that UNDP intercede with the executing agencies to help improve the timeliness and quality of their inputs. She also asked that a post of Deputy Resident Representative be financed by UNDP, as stipulated by Governing Council decision 91/29 of 25 June 1991, in view of the size of the programme.

6. Delegations noted the programme's emphasis on the management and planning needs of the country, and were pleased to see the increasing role of UNDP in providing the level and type of expertise required to respond to the country's specific needs. Delegations asked for clarification on the role of the United Nations Resident Coordinator in coordinating the various kinds of technical cooperation in Kuwait. An inquiry was also made as to whether the International Labour Organisation (ILO) had opened an office in Kuwait.

7. In reply, the Assistant Administrator pointed out that following the Gulf crisis, the Resident Coordinator's office was closed and was being reopened in stages. There was currently a UNDP Resident Representative but not a Resident Coordinator. He expressed hope that the Resident Coordinator's office would be functioning fully in the near future. As to the post of Deputy Resident Representative, he said he would pursue the matter with the departments concerned.

8. The Committee recommended that the Governing Council approve the fifth country programme for Kuwait.

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

9. Introducing the fifth country programme for the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (DP/CP/LIB/5), with a net indicative planning figure (IPF) of $2.4 million and estimated cost-sharing of $38 million, the Resident Representative said that the country programme reflected the priorities which were outlined in the country's comprehensive mobilization plan. Those were: (a) human resource development and capacity-building; (b) economic diversification; (c) rehabilitation and maintenance of capital assets; (d) management of the environment; and (e) transfer of technology and scientific research. He noted that the programme had been the result of intensive consultations.

10. The strategy proposed for the country programme aimed to reduce the reliance of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on oil energy and to create long-term economic growth in other sectors. The programme would also help to build management capacity and ensure a more optimal use of human, capital and

financial resources to achieve a more diversified economic base. Areas such as national training to reduce dependency on expatriates was also given due attention. The country programme had placed emphasis on the preservation of the environment by creating an appropriate strategy to that effect. In addition to the main areas of concentration, the programme would also pay appropriate attention to such issues as strengthening the role of women and promotion of technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC). The national execution modality would receive due attention in close collaboration with all institutions of the United Nations system.

11. Delegations noted that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya faced a number of serious problems. UNDP assistance was essential to meet the needs of the country. The Government was financing 90 per cent of the programme, an indication of their cooperation with UNDP. The country's development policies were in harmony with UNDP thematic priorities. The representative of Libya expressed appreciation for UNDP assistance in preparing the fifth country programme and stated that the Government attached great importance to its cooperation with UNDP. With its small population the country needed skills and technical expertise. It would continue to cooperate with UNDP in all areas of mutual interest such as combating desertification and enhancing human resources. He also noted UNDP support for combating the screwworm and stated that those efforts had had widespread benefits in the region. The fifth country programme was a balanced and objective document and national authorities would make every effort to implement the programme.

12. The Resident Representative thanked all countries for their assistance to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in its efforts to eradicate the screwworm. He noted that the country also enjoyed assistance from bilateral donors ~~in~~ such sectors as the protection of environment, women in development and management of water resources.

13. The Committee recommended that the Governing Council approve the fifth country programme for the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

Qatar

14. The third country programme for Qatar (DP/CP/QAT/3 and Corr.1), with a net IPF of $69,000 and $10 million in cost-sharing was presented by the Assistant Administrator and Director, RBAS. The four areas of technical cooperation were (a) the development of human resources; (b) improving economic policy-making; (c) planning and management; and (d) sustainable environment and natural resources development.

15. The representative of Qatar expressed his country's appreciation for the cooperation provided by UNDP and the executing agencies, especially for training. He added that his country looked forward to the implementation of the country programme and the attainment of its important development objectives.

16. The Assistant Administrator noted with gratitude Qatar's satisfaction with UNDP cooperation, particularly since it was a net contributor country.

17. The Committee recommended that the Governing Council approve the third country programme for Qatar.

2. Case-by-case approvals: Iraq

18. The Chairman brought to the attention of the Committee a note by the Administrator on case-by-case project approval in Iraq (DP/1993/71), in which the Governing Council was informed of the Administrator's intention to approve projects in Iraq on a case-by-case basis, in view of the prevailing situation, using as a frame of reference the cooperation programme of the United Nations Inter-Agency Humanitarian Programme in Iraq.

19. The Committee took note of the Administrator's intention to continue to approve projects in Iraq on a case-by-case basis.

UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.10
15 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR
PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

Addendum

CHAPTER III. COUNTRY, INTERCOUNTRY AND GLOBAL PROGRAMMES

C. Arab States

(continued)

Sudan

1. The Resident Representative presented the fourth country programme for the Sudan (DP/CP/SUD/4) with a net indicative planning figure (IPF) of $45 million. He pointed out that the programme concentrated on poverty alleviation and sustainable development in three areas of focus: (a) sustainable rural development; (b) promotion of food security; and (c) strengthening national capacity to manage development and macroeconomic reform. The first area of focus, the Area Development Scheme, covered over 1 million people and emphasized food security. Its first phase had just been evaluated independently and was shown to have taken root as a successful community-based participatory development programme.

2. A number of delegations commented on the proposed fourth country programme. Delegations endorsed the programme in general. Some expressed the following concerns: the programme should be reviewed and presented to the Governing Council at its forty-first session (1994); emphasis should be placed on food security; the social, political and physical implementation environment of the country programme should be examined; and the programme should benefit rural populations in all parts of the country.

3. The Minister of State for International Cooperation of the Sudan made a general statement in which he emphasized his Government's commitment to the creation of the necessary conditions for durable peace and sustainable development, with particular emphasis on rural coverage throughout the country.

4. The Committee recommended that the Council approve the fourth country programme: (a) with the understanding that the activities as proposed would have a primary focus on food security and sustainable rural agriculture development; and (b) would be subject to a policy review, after one year, of the impact of the overall enabling environment of the country on the implementation of the programme, bearing in mind the report of the Standing Committee on Programme Matters.

UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.11
15 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME
MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

Addendum

CHAPTER III. COUNTRY, INTERCOUNTRY AND GLOBAL PROGRAMMES (continued)

D. Latin America and the Caribbean

2. Extensions of country programmes

Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, British Virgin Islands, Guyana, Netherlands Antilles, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago

1. The Assistant Administrator and Director, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC), introduced the requests for a second extension of eight country programmes: first country programme for Aruba (DP/CP/ARU/1/EXTENSION II, with a net indicative planning figure (IPF) of $153,000); second country programme for the Bahamas (DP/CP/BHA/2/EXTENSION II, with cost-sharing of $65,000, no IPF); fourth country programme for Barbados (DP/CP/BAR/4/EXTENSION II, with a net IPF of $228,000); second country programme for the British Virgin Islands (DP/CP/BVI/2/EXTENSION II, with a net IPF of $60,000); fourth country programme for Guyana (DP/CP/GUY/4/EXTENSION II, with a net IPF of $2.9 million); second country programme for the Netherlands Antilles (DP/CP/NAN/2/EXTENSION II, with cost-sharing of $762,000, no IPF); third country programme for Suriname (DP/CP/SUR/3/EXTENSION II, with a net IPF of $248,000); and fourth country programme for Trinidad and Tobago (DP/CP/TRI/4/EXTENSION II, with a net IPF of $480,000).

2. The Assistant Administrator noted the vulnerability of the countries to changes in the international economy as well as in the natural environment. Conventional indicators such as per capita income were proving to be increasingly unreliable measures of human development in the context of small island countries. With the exception of Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago, the countries under discussion had attained net contributor or similar status and had relatively small IPFs. The fifth cycle programmes for those countries were expected to be submitted to the Governing Council at its forty-first session (1994).

3. One delegation recommended that the tourism sector for Aruba be reviewed to ensure that the projections for expansion of the sector were compatible with the long-term sustainable development prospects of the island. Another delegation recommended that UNDP assistance be directed to projects that bolstered the Government's ability to promote economic development and endorsed programmes directed at training government personnel in project development, implementation and evaluation. He proposed that the sectoral orientation of the programme for Suriname be reviewed to place more emphasis on the development of cooperatives and assistance to the vegetable and fisheries sector, focusing on small producers. Further efforts to make a stock assessment of coastal resources were encouraged and support was noted for UNDP proposals to develop energy alternatives and conservation promotion, especially in rural areas.

4. The Committee recommended that the Council approve the second extensions of the country programmes for Aruba, the Bahamas, Barbados, the British Virgin Islands, Guyana, the Netherlands Antilles, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago.

UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.12
15 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

CHAPTER IV. UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND (continued)

DRAFT DECISION

The Governing Council

1. Approves the following country programmes:

Sub-Saharan Africa

Central African Republic	DP/FPA/CP/126
Côte d'Ivoire	DP/FPA/CP/131
Ethiopia	DP/FPA/CP/132
Guinea-Bissau	DP/FPA/CP/124
Madagascar	DP/FPA/CP/121
Mali	DP/FPA/CP/130
Sao Tome and Principe	DP/FPA/CP/125
Sierra Leone	DP/FPA/CP/122
Uganda	DP/FPA/CP/128

Asia and the Pacific

Lao People's Democratic Republic	DP/FPA/CP/120
Pakistan	DP/FPA/CP/134

Latin America and the Caribbean

Colombia	DP/FPA/CP/123
Guatemala	DP/FPA/CP/133

2. Approves the second country programme for Equatorial Guinea (DP/FPA/CP/129) with the provision that the Executive Director shall present an interim report to the Council at its forty-first session on the implementation of the country programme;

3. Approves the third country programme for Rwanda (DP/FPA/CP/127) with the provision that the Executive Director shall present an interim report to the Council at its forty-first session on the implementation of the country programme as well as on the impact which the evolution of the general context of the country may have on the implementation of the programme.

UNITED NATIONS

DP

Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.13
15 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

CHAPTER III. COUNTRY, INTERCOUNTRY AND GLOBAL PROGRAMMES

Latin America (continued)

1. Country programme approvals

El Salvador

1. The Assistant Administrator and Director, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC) presented the fifth country programme for El Salvador (DP/CP/ELS/5) with a net indicative planning figure (IPF) of $6.7 million. He reminded the Committee that the Secretary-General had cited El Salvador as an excellent example of implementation of his Agenda for Peace, with assistance from the United Nations system, including UNDP. Some of the activities in 1992 included promotion of dialogue between the Government and the civil society; resource mobilization in support of the plan for reconstruction; creation of a trust fund in support of the reintegration of ex-combatants into civil life; support to the new National Police Academy; and promotion of transparency in the electoral process. The programme for 1993-1996 focused on four areas: (a) national reconstruction and strengthening of democratic institutions; (b) poverty and employment; (c) modernization of the State; and (d) environment and sustainable development. He noted that resources mobilized to carry out the work were estimated to be five times the IPF.

2. The representative of El Salvador described the historical links between his Government and the United Nations and between peace and development. He stressed the importance of continuing support from the international community to ensure the success of the peace process.

3. Several delegations highlighted the important multiplier effect of the IPF in El Salvador. It was an example of how UNDP resources could be used as seed money and was a demonstration of the support for UNDP activities on the part of the Government and other donors. One delegation emphasized the role of UNDP in the implementation of the peace agreements, noting that there was need for a clearer mandate for UNDP in the new area of activity to enable it to respond quickly to the demand for its services. Many delegations expressed support for the country programme and its areas of concentration. One considered it to be one of the best structured programmes submitted. Two delegations expressed concern for its broad scope, particularly in relation to management development. One delegation wondered whether the country programme was too ambitious considering the present situation. The role of UNDP in coordination was commended and it was suggested that in the area of environment and development, there be more collaboration with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and with the communities involved.

4. The Committee recommended that the Council approve the fifth country programme for El Salvador.

Saint Helena

5. The Assistant Administrator and Director, RBLAC, presented the second country programme for Saint Helena (DP/CP/STH/2) with a net IPF of $2 million. He drew attention to the physical location and limited resource base of the country as factors that contributed to the difficulty in achieving sustainable development. The main development objectives of the island were a better use of limited national resources, reduced dependence on external aid and the creation of suitable employment opportunities. UNDP cooperation would complement that of the major donor country and was targeted at three areas of concentration: (a) the universal pension scheme; (b) tourism development; and (c) the livestock development programme.

6. The representative of one delegation stated that his Government strongly supported the programme, noting that the island was located in the South Atlantic, with a population of about 5,000 people. It relied on shipping and there was no air service to the island. The island itself was not economically viable and relied to a great extent on external aid. He endorsed the focus on the development of tourism, which would provide some external earnings, and on livestock development, which would contribute to self-sufficiency. Another delegation questioned the appropriateness of placing Saint Helena under the responsibility of the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, since the island is nearer to the coast of Africa. He suggested that the Committee propose to the Council the possibility of giving the responsibility for Saint Helena to another regional bureau.

7. The Assistant Administrator mentioned that the reason for placing Saint Helena under the responsibility of the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean was based on the practical consideration of transportation links. Although only 1,900 miles from Angola, there was no transportation link with that country, while there was a link between Saint Helena and the Caribbean. In response to the question raised by one delegation, he indicated

that UNDP would look further into the possibility of placing Saint Helena under the responsibility of another bureau.

8. The Committee recommended that the Council approve the second country programme for Saint Helena.

CHAPTER V. FIELD VISITS

9. Reports were presented by the delegations of Lesotho and Pakistan on two field visits, each lasting two weeks and undertaken in April and May 1993. Participants from 11 Member States of the Governing Council visited Benin and Burkina Faso, and 10 participants visited El Salvador and Jamaica. Each team was accompanied by a senior official from UNDP headquarters.

10. The reports of the teams on their observations covered a number of topics: the programme approach; the comparative advantages of UNDP; national capacity-building and national execution; decentralization; coordination; agency support costs; headquarters/field communications; Office of Project Services; private sector in development; women in development; technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC), environment and development; HIV/AIDS; United Nations Volunteers; administrative issues such as common premises; and United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)-specific issues.

11. Participants commented favourably on the manner in which the visits, including project visits, had been organized. The teams were briefed by UNDP/UNFPA staff at headquarters and subsequently by the offices of UNDP Resident Representatives and UNFPA Country Directors in the field. The terms of reference developed by the Standing Committee at its meeting in February 1992 had provided helpful guidance for the preparation of the visits in the field. However, in the light of experience, certain aspects of the terms of reference needed refinement so that future field visits could be more sharply focused on a manageable number of issues, particularly for visits of five working days per country.

12. While acknowledging that in-depth familiarization with the operations of UNDP/UNFPA field offices had not been possible in the short time available, the participants shared the view that the programme of discussions and project visits enabled them to acquire a better grasp of UNDP and UNFPA support to development efforts in countries visited. It was also considered that the informal discussions of the Committee on the reports had been useful.

13. Delegations proposed that the terms of reference for future field visits should continue to emphasize that the visits were intended to be of an informative nature; also that sensitive areas such as national security or other political issues would remain outside the scope of the terms of reference. The possibility of preparing reports on the field visits during the visits was discussed.

14. The Committee also reviewed the report of the Bureau of the Council containing a synthesis of the findings and recommendations of the field visits to 12 countries in 1992 (DP/1993/66) as requested at its meeting in February 1993. The document was found to be comprehensive and informative.

Several delegations stated that the synthesis of the findings and recommendations on various programming and administrative issues in the field provided a useful reference for the Committee for consideration of the specific issues under its broader programme of work.

15. Delegations considered that to maximize the benefits of the visits for the work of the Governing Council, participants in future field visits should be government delegates who participated in the work of the Council. The widest possible geographical representation and appropriate gender balance should be maintained in the composition of the teams.

16. It was also suggested that the presence of the Resident Representative or his senior staff in all meetings and project visits, while useful, was not expected. Moreover, issues selected for examination should primarily be priority issues specific to the countries visited.

17. The Secretary of the Governing Council outlined plans for future field visits in 1993 and 1994. Visits to Albania and Uzbekistan were planned for August 1993. In April/May 1994, two countries in the African region would be visited. In January 1994, two countries in the Asia and Pacific region would be visited. In addition, visits were planned to two countries in the Arab region. Subject to budgetary resources, a field visit to two countries in Latin America and the Caribbean region would be planned for April/May 1994. Consultations would be undertaken with Governments in order to identify the countries for field visits being planned for 1994.

18. The terms of reference for the field visits were revised by an informal working group of the Committee and approved by the Committee. The revised terms of reference are contained in the annex to the present report.

UNITED
NATIONS

DP/

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.14
15 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

Addendum

Chapter XI. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS

1. Following its consideration of the items before it, the Standing Committee recommended that the Governing Council adopt the following draft decisions:

DRAFT DECISION I

Country, intercountry and global programmes

I

The Governing Council

Approves the following country programmes:

Africa

Fifth country programme for Benin	DP/CP/BEN/5
Fifth country programme for Burundi	DP/CP/BDI/5
Fifth country programme for Côte d'Ivoire	DP/CP/IVC/5
Fourth country programme for Equatorial Guinea	DP/CP/EQG/4
Fifth country programme for Gabon	DP/CP/GAB/5
Fourth country programme for Guinea-Bissau	DP/CP/GBS/4
Fifth country programme for Mauritius	DP/CP/MAR/5

Fourth country programme for Mozambique and Corr.1	DP/CP/MOZ/4
First country programme for Namibia	DP/CP/NAM/1
Fifth country programme for Sierra Leone	DP/CP/SIL/5
Asia and the Pacific	
First country programme for Marshall Islands	DP/CP/MAS/1
First country programme for Micronesia	DP/CP/MIC/1
Fifth country programme for Mongolia	DP/CP/MON/5
First country programme for Pacific Multi-Islands	DP/CP/PMI/1
Fifth country programme for Pakistan	DP/CP/PAK/5
First country programme for Palau	DP/CP/PLU/1
Fifth country programme for the Philippines	DP/CP/PHI/5
Fifth country programme for the Republic of Korea	DP/CP/ROK/5
Third country programme for Vanuatu	DP/CP/VAN/3
Arab States	
Fifth country programme for Bahrain	DP/CP/BAH/5
Fifth country programme for Kuwait and Corr.1	DP/CP/KUW/5
Fifth country programme for Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	DP/CP/LIB/5
Third country programme for Qatar and Corr.1	DP/CP/QAT/3
Latin America and the Caribbean	
El Salvador	DP/CP/ELS/5
Saint Helena	DP/CP/STH/2

II

Approves the fifth country programme for the United Republic of Tanzania on the understanding that the Administrator will submit a report to the Governing Council at its forty-first session (1994) on the advancement of the programme in the light of comments made by the Standing Committee for Programme Matters at its in-session meeting held during the fortieth session of the Council;

III

Approves the fourth country programme for the Sudan: (a) with the understanding that the activities as proposed will have a primary focus on food security and sustainable rural agriculture development; and (b) will be subject to a policy review, after one year, of the impact of the overall enabling environment of the country on the implementation of the programme, bearing in mind the report of the Standing Committee on Programme Matters;

IV

Endorses the recommendation of the Administrator contained in document DP/1993/62 to continue the fifth country programme for Malawi maintaining the sharp focus on human development through poverty alleviation while at the same time actively encouraging and facilitating the process of political change and its contribution to the achievement of the programme goals. Should the required complementary assistance mentioned in the Administrator's report not materialize, the Committee recommended that the Administrator bring the matter again to the attention of the Governing Council;

V

Approves the amendments to the fifth country programme for Rwanda contained in the report of the Administrator (DP/1993/64);

VI

Approves the extension by one year of the following country programmes:

Africa	
Angola	DP/CP/ANG/2/EXTENSION II
Congo	DP/CP/PRC/3/EXTENSION II
Kenya	DP/CP/KEN/5/EXTENSION II
Madagascar	DP/CP/MAG/4/EXTENSION II
Togo	DP/CP/TOG/4/EXTENSION II
Zaire	DP/CP/ZAI/4/EXTENSION II
Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States	
Albania	DP/CP/ALB/3/EXTENSION II
Latin America and the Caribbean	
Aruba	DP/CP/ARU/1/EXTENSION II
Bahamas	DP/CP/BHA/2/EXTENSION II
Barbados	DP/CP/BAR/4/EXTENSION II
British Virgin Islands	DP/CP/BVI/2/EXTENSION II
Guyana	DP/CP/GUY/4/EXTENSION II
Netherlands Antilles	DP/CP/NAN/2/EXTENSION II
Suriname	DP/CP/SUR/3/EXTENSION II
Trinidad and Tobago	DP/CP/TRI/4/EXTENSION II

VII

Takes note of the Administrator's intention to continue to approve projects in Iraq on a case-by-case basis;

VIII

Takes note of the report of the Administrator on programme management issues, including decentralization and the programme approach.

UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.15
15 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

CHAPTER VII. PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT ISSUES, INCLUDING DECENTRALIZATION AND THE COUNTRY PROGRAMME APPROACH

1. The Assistant Administrator presented document DP/1993/24. Discussion followed on the programme approach and guiding principles, the programme support document, decentralization and mid-term review and monitoring.

2. Several delegations expressed their satisfaction with the discussion, which had provided an opportunity to exchange ideas among themselves and with the Administration. They looked forward to similar discussions at future meetings of the Standing Committee.

Programme approach and Programme Support Document

3. A draft of the Guiding Principles for the Programme Approach was presented to Governments at an informal session of the Governing Council in September 1992. Delegations that inquired about the delay in the distribution of the Guiding Principles were informed that they had now been circulated to all UNDP offices. The Programme Support Document (PSD) would similarly be distributed shortly to all offices. The need to incorporate feedback from the specialized agencies was given as the main reason for the delay.

4. Questions were raised about the nature of the PSD. Inquiries were also made about national programme managers and their relationship with UNDP.

5. It was explained that the PSD represents the attempt of UNDP to respond to General Assembly resolution 44/211 of 22 December 1989, which contained calls for more programme-oriented mechanisms.

6. The Committee was informed that the focus of the new country programme was on the overall support needed to develop and implement three or four national programmes. It conveyed in broad terms the totality of UNDP cooperation proposed for the period covered, normally five years. The PSD was the instrument, formulated subsequently, to justify and present in detail UNDP support to each of the three or four programmes. It explained why UNDP, in accordance with its mandate, was involved and what it would be doing in terms of capacity-building. It contained indicators of success and financial information by output and inputs. The PSD was designed to be a flexible document.

7. Regarding national programme managers, it was explained that the programme approach worked only if it was adopted at the national level with commitment on the part of the national authorities. Similarly, the programme manager had to be a national if ownership and sustainability were to be goals. UNDP might provide logistic support and expertise to assist managers to carry out their task efficiently.

8. Some delegations felt that the country programmes still did not fully reflect the programme approach. In response, it was explained that the new format for country programmes had to be introduced in early 1991 before agreement had been reached on what exactly constituted the programme approach. For the sixth programming cycle, the format of the country programme would be brought in line with the programme approach.

9. Referring to paragraph 15, and to the omission of a country that, as pointed out by one delegation, had been applying the programme approach, it was explained that the list presented in the paragraph was not exhaustive.

10. There was agreement that the terminology used in the context of programming was not always clear or even precisely defined: in particular, the word "programme" was used to refer to several different concepts. Several delegations preferred to keep the term "country programme" rather than to replace it with "UNDP country strategy".

Decentralization and coordination

11. The issue of decentralization and the financial delegation of authority to the field was addressed by the Committee. The work done in that regard by the Administrator was commended by several delegations. In addition, specific queries were made as to the actual extent of financial delegation referred to in the report. While it was stated in paragraph 19 that the Resident Representative had financial approval authority up to $1 million, it was stated in paragraph 20 (a) that delegation to the Resident Representative is at the discretion of the Director of the Regional Bureau. Furthermore, delegations inquired whether the $1 million level existed for all projects, irrespective of the size of the programme, and whether further decentralization was contemplated.

12. In reply to the points raised, the Assistant Administrator confirmed that the amount delegated to the Resident Representative was $1 million for all projects, irrespective of the size of the programme; that decentralization was considered to be a process that continued to evolve and that the discretion mentioned in paragraph 20 (a) referred to projects over $3 million and to the mandated hierarchical relationship existing between a Resident Representative and a Regional Bureau Director.

13. Additional clarifications made in relation to queries by delegations related to the Administrator's intention to strengthen national expertise as a strategy for empowering field staff capacity (para 24. (a)); to the introduction of monitoring and financial systems to facilitate the decentralization of both programme and financial authority; and to the emphasis on introducing substantive indicators for monitoring country office programme quality. Finally, the Assistant Administrator described how the enhanced Division Chief concept was being progressively applied through increased consultation and teamwork between headquarters and the country offices.

14. Concern was raised about the need to reinforce field offices substantively and to strengthen national personnel involved in national execution. It was observed that staff numbers were in most cases sufficient. It was rather a question of having the right staff profile and prioritizing functions. To that effect, the Assistant Administrator stated that good, substantive Professional staff were in the field offices and that local expertise was increasingly drawn upon. It was not feasible to have technical expertise in every field, but experts could be brought in to appraise and evaluate programme support.

15. Some delegations also expressed concern about the lack of resources available to the resident coordinator and asked whether indeed any resources were at the disposal of the resident coordinator for coordination purposes. In answer to the inquiry, it was explained that the resident coordinator as such had no budget to support the tasks and functions of the post.

Mid-term review and monitoring

16. It was observed that evaluation and reporting on earlier projects were not adequately reflected in the country programmes. Past experience, tangible results and successes were not well documented. There was a general concern that more emphasis should be placed on monitoring and evaluation. It was suggested that, if Professional staff in field offices delegated administrative tasks to national counterparts, they could do more monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes.

17. Concerning mid-term reviews, some delegations inquired about the process and the selection of the programmes to be reviewed. It was explained that the mid-term review was the occasion to assess how UNDP was trying to meet the objectives of the current cycle. A tentative schedule (DP/1993/6) had been considered by the Governing Council in February 1993; it would be updated in early 1994. The Council would decide in advance which individual reviews it wished to see.

18. Efforts would be made to include more explicit success indicators in the country programmes. However, it was not easy at the time of preparing the

country programme to determine the specific contribution of UNDP. Those details would be included in the programme support documents formulated subsequently.

19. The Central Evaluation Office (CEO) had worked on the question of evaluating the UNDP contribution to country programmes. A substantive presentation on monitoring and evaluation would constitute a separate subject of discussion at the current session of the Governing Council.

UNITED NATIONS

DP

Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.16
16 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

Addendum

CHAPTER III. COUNTRY, INTERCOUNTRY AND GLOBAL PROGRAMMES (continued)

E. Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States

Albania

1. The Resident Representative introduced the second extension of the third country programme for Albania (DP/CP/ALB/3/EXTENSION II) with a net indicative planning figure (IPF) of $1.6 million. He indicated that the reason for the extension was the evolution of the political, economic and social situation in Albania. In March 1992, Albania held its first free elections, which established a democratic regime. Since then the new regime and new President have undertaken some basic reforms which resulted in a move towards a market economy, a balanced exchange rate and the removal of subsidies, except on some key commodities. He pointed out, however, that the transition had been a difficult one for Albania and that under the circumstances it would have been extremely difficult to formulate a five-year programme. Therefore, it was considered more appropriate to design a programme that focused on urgent needs, which formed part of an umbrella project. He noted that UNDP resources to meet the needs of Albania were limited. That related to Albania's request for "as if" LDC status, which would be considered by the Governing Council as a separate item.

2. Several delegations made interventions in support of UNDP activities in Albania. They drew attention to the focus of the programme envisaged under the extension, emphasizing particularly UNDP activities in the area of human

development, the social dimension of structural adjustment, the struggle against poverty, support for elections and national capacity-building. They also expressed their satisfaction with UNDP activities in supporting women in development and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that were becoming very active in Albania.

3. One delegation inquired whether the priorities contained in the extension of the programme had been agreed to by the Albanian Government. Another delegation asked whether the extension of the programme was dependent on the Governing Council's response to the request for "as if" LDC status. One delegation questioned how UNDP activities were linked to those being carried out by NGOs and another noted that the activities mentioned in the extension far exceeded the available UNDP resources.

4. In responding to questions raised, the Resident Representative confirmed the full involvement and support of the Albanian Government for the activities foreseen under the extension. He acknowledged that the volume of activities could not be met by UNDP resources, which was one of the reasons for the Government's decision to request "as if" LDC status. In addition, however, he was actively seeking co-financing for some of these activities with the local representatives of the Governments of France, Italy and the United States of America and the European Economic Community and World Bank, as well as with representatives of other donors. With regard to NGOs, he confirmed that he was working closely with those organizations and, in fact, chaired weekly meetings to ensure full coordination among their activities and those of UNDP.

5. The Committee recommended that the Governing Council approve a second extension of the third country programme for Albania.

B. Asia and the Pacific (continued)

2. Assistance to Myanmar

6. The Standing Committee had before it for consideration document DP/1993/60 on assistance to the Union of Myanmar. The Assistant Administrator and Director, Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific, introduced the report. He noted that all aspects of Governing Council decision 92/26 of May 1992 had been fully implemented. He referred to the Administrator's recommendation in the report that $40 million be released from fifth cycle indicative planning figure (IPF) resources for Myanmar for programmes in four high-priority areas, all having impact at the grass-roots level. Should the Council approve the recommendation, individual projects would be designed with clear focus on sustainable benefits and human needs at the community level. Direct dialogue and the inputs of the beneficiary communities would be essential ingredients of project formulation and implementation. He also pointed out that a participatory approach to community development would be the key to the selection and implementation of those projects. Sustainability would be assured through training of community leaders and operational and technical personnel. All the projects would have maximum synergy with activities of other United Nations agencies such as the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the World Health Organization (WHO), and

there would be maximum possible involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

7. Delegations commended UNDP on the implementation of Governing Council decision 92/26. Many delegations expressed support for the full package of proposals in the report, including release of $40 million from the fifth cycle IPF for programming over the period July 1993-December 1995. They noted that the evaluation of the programme conducted by the Central Evaluation Office in accordance with resolution 92/26 had indicated the technical soundness of programmes implemented so far and the need for support to the four areas proposed for continued UNDP assistance. They noted that the proposals outlined in the report were fully justified given the needs of the people of Myanmar and the limited resource flows to the country. Several delegates underlined the coordination role of UNDP at the country level and affirmed that UNDP was the main backstopping agency for United Nations operations in Myanmar. Limiting resources to the UNDP programmes would undermine that role. One delegation noted that the $40 million requested for fifth cycle proposals amounted to less than one half of total fifth cycle IPF resources.

8. Some other delegations expressed concern that the conditions which led to Governing Council resolution 92/26 had not significantly changed and therefore departure from the conditions laid down in that resolution could not be made at this juncture. They therefore proposed that the Governing Council approve a limited amount of resources (less than that recommended in the report) in order to allow UNDP to continue, for the time being, in directing assistance to the grass-roots level. They nevertheless recognized the needs of the people of Myanmar and the positive impact of the UNDP programme. They proposed that (a) new projects continue to be targeted to meet the basic needs of the poor at the grass-roots level in the areas of primary health care, HIV/AIDS, training and education and food security; (b) all new projects continue to be approved by the Administrator on a project-by-project basis and special attention be given to ensuring proper monitoring arrangements; and (c) the situation be reviewed on an annual basis and the Governing Council informed accordingly. One delegation stated that UNDP cooperation should cover all areas of the country, including the state of Arakan.

9. The Assistant Administrator noted delegations' appreciation for UNDP satisfactory implementation of resolution 92/26. He noted that the report of the Administrator looked back at the review of the programme and forward in making recommendations for continued UNDP assistance to Myanmar. In so doing, UNDP had tried to stay within both the letter and spirit of resolution 92/26. The Representative of Myanmar expressed appreciation to UNDP for the assistance so far provided and for the proposed programme of assistance. He thanked the delegations that lent their support to the proposals. He expressed the view that modification of the programme as presented would alter the basic premises upon which the recommendations had been made and would therefore affect the overall success of the programme. He stated that his Government would ensure that IPF resources would be used to optimum effect in close collaboration with UNDP.

10. The Chairman, in summing up, noted that consensus had been expressed that UNDP should continue to address the development needs of Myanmar. Some delegates recommended approval of the proposed programme as presented; others

used expressions such as "sufficient" and "limited" in regard to the amount of funds to be released.

11. The Committee held informal consultations among interested Council Members. A draft decision was prepared for the consideration of the Standing Committee (see document DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.17).

UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.17
16 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

CHAPTER III. COUNTRY, INTERCOUNTRY AND GLOBAL PROGRAMMES

Asia and the Pacific (continued)

DRAFT DECISION

Assistance to Myanmar

The Governing Council,

Noting the report of the Administrator (DP/1993/60) on the actions taken on its decision 92/26 of 26 May 1992 and containing his recommendations for future programming of assistance to Myanmar,

Also noting with satisfaction the report of the detailed review of the fifth country programme for Myanmar and the recommendations of the evaluation mission,

Recognizing that there are critical humanitarian and basic human development needs of all the people of Myanmar at the community level which require focused external assistance and continuation of United Nations Development Programme assistance at an operationally cost-effective level, which should be made available for the benefit of all peoples of Myanmar,

Noting the recommendation of the Administrator for a release of funds from the fifth cycle indicative planning figure allocations for Myanmar for programmes during a two-and-one-half year period, July 1993 to December 1995,

1. Commends the Administrator for the speedy and full implementation of decision 92/26;

2. Decides that, until a country programme for Myanmar is considered at an appropriate time, all future assistance from the United Nations Development Programme and related funds to Myanmar should be clearly targeted towards programmes having grass-roots-level impact in a sustainable manner, as called for in the aforesaid decision 92/26 particularly in the areas of primary health care, the environment, HIV/AIDS, training and education and food security;

3. Approves, in conformity with paragraph 2 above, in addition to the amounts released from the reallocation of carried-over fourth cycle resources, and subject to review at its forty-first session (1994), an expenditure of up to $18 million from fifth cycle indicative planning figure allocations for the 18-month period to December 1994;

4. Requests the Administrator to continue to approve assistance to Myanmar on a project-by-project basis and to present to the Governing Council a report on the status of approval and implementation of new projects and recommendations for future programming, for its review at its forty-first session (1994).

UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.18
16 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

CHAPTER VI. EVALUATION

Evaluation

1. The Standing Committee had before it the report of the Administrator on evaluation (DP/1993/26). In his introduction, the Director of the Central Evaluation Office (CEO) noted that the report discussed, inter alia, progress in implementing the strategy for monitoring and evaluation for the fifth programming cycle and in developing an evaluation methodology with respect to the six areas of focus. It summarized the status of other work undertaken by CEO on the strengthening of national monitoring and evaluation capacity, ex-post evaluation, feedback of evaluation findings, databases and publications.

2. The Director drew attention to the shift from project- to programme-level evaluations and the successful decentralization of the management of project evaluations to the Regional Bureaux. He mentioned that draft guidelines for assessing capacity-building were being prepared that would propose a different approach to establishing indicators of progress, including the six areas of focus established in decision 90/34 of 23 June 1990. He noted the need for an improved system for monitoring programme implementation based on criteria determined at the formulation stage. Participation of national authorities and target beneficiaries in monitoring and evaluation also needed to be addressed. He also noted that guidelines for country programme evaluations had been prepared; CEO had been involved in the incorporation of monitoring and evaluation structures into new programme initiatives; and a preliminary assessment of the pilot phase of the Sustainable Development Network and an evaluation of the Global Environment Facility were being undertaken. UNDP continued to convene an Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation, and the members of the Joint Consultative Group on Policy (JCGP) were working closely

with the JCGP subgroup on harmonization in the follow-up to General Assembly resolution 47/199 of 22 December 1992. Finally, three initiatives (feedback study, questionnaire and statistical analysis), undertaken over the past year to examine and determine the role of feedback of evaluation findings in UNDP, were mentioned and the preliminary conclusions summarized.

3. The quality of the report was commended by delegations, who noted its comprehensiveness and strategic approach. They underlined the importance of evaluation and its orientation towards results and impact. They welcomed the importance attached in the report to capacity-building for evaluation and monitoring, both inside UNDP and at the national level. One delegation noted the importance of ensuring quality control in evaluations, particularly in those carried out by end-users and by implementers.

4. Delegations stressed that CEO should continue to concentrate its evaluations on impact and not on process and should undertake more methodological studies. It should also be involved in setting priorities, strategic planning and developing indicators in such areas as poverty alleviation and capacity-building. Several delegations stressed the need to set up evaluation indicators that could serve as a basis for an early-warning system. Such indicators should be part of strategic planning and contribute towards cost-effectiveness and sustainability.

5. Many delegations stressed the need for feedback and requested that a synopsis of the feedback study be provided to the Governing Council at its forty-first session. It was essential for UNDP to show results and to indicate what worked or did not work, and why. The establishment of base-line surveys was encouraged.

6. Several delegations reiterated that mechanisms for coordination between different bodies of the United Nations system should be developed in order to make the best use of limited resources, to encourage complementarity and to enhance impact through joint efforts. The contribution of UNDP to a common United Nations system approach to evaluation and UNDP participation in efforts in the JCGP working group on harmonization was underlined.

7. With respect to the African economists programme, a few delegations suggested that UNDP use all available reliable sources of data, national as well as external, and help strengthen data collection at the national level. The representative of the Department for Development Support and Management Service emphasized in that connection the role that his Department could play in contributing to available information for field offices to keep abreast of economic developments at the country level in order to ensure the smooth functioning of United Nations programmes. One delegation stressed that the fielding of economists by UNDP was in support of the Resident Coordinators and would provide needed flexibility. The economists should be able to benefit from a variety of sources of information.

8. Many delegations expressed the view that the work of CEO was not widely known and suggested that Governing Council members be informed of the availability of new evaluation reports. There was a need to provide more information to the international community on UNDP responsiveness to its concerns. Evaluation reports could help inform national parliaments when the

level of future contributions to UNDP was being discussed. It was noted by one delegation that the country studies for China and India on monitoring the programme approach would be of great value.

9. Another issue raised by several delegations was the staffing of CEO. With reference to Governing Council decision 92/24 of 26 May 1992, in which the Council called on UNDP and the Administrator to strengthen CEO, delegations pointed out that the lack of follow-up on this point unavoidably limited CEO capacity to implement fully its work plan and affected accountability. Several delegations reiterated their position on the need to strengthen CEO staffing. In that connection, several delegations considered that the CEO work plan was ambitious and its priorities should be reviewed and such cost-effective approaches as joint evaluations with other partners within and outside the United Nations system, including donors, be considered in order to disseminate results and methodologies. One delegation suggested focusing on such corporate concerns as the programme approach and national execution. Another requested clarification on the criteria used for the thematic and geographical allocations under the first objective of the work plan and on the use and impact of Special Programme Resources (SPRs).

10. In response, the Director, CEO, expressed appreciation for the interest and support for the work of CEO. He provided additional information on the dissemination of evaluation reports; quality control of project evaluation in collaboration with Regional Bureaux; the use of data; indicators for country programme evaluations; the scope and scale of the CEO work programme and his dilemma in setting priorities in a context of limited resources (human and financial) versus increased demand; the concept of joint evaluations; and the use of SPR.

11. The Committee took note of the report of the Administrator and subsequently recommended that the Governing Council approve the draft decision contained in document DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.8/Rev.1.

UNITED NATIONS

DP

Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.19
16 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

CHAPTER III. COUNTRY, INTERCOUNTRY AND GLOBAL PROGRAMMES

C. Arab States (continued)

3. Oral report on Somalia

1. As requested by the Governing Council at its special session in February 1993, the Resident Representative for Somalia provided an oral report on the status of the rehabilitation project and other ongoing projects approved on a case-by-case basis by the Administrator. He noted that UNDP had moved rapidly to provide resources for community-based rehabilitation activities in secure areas and intended to expand its coverage as security permitted.

2. Delegations, including that of Somalia, supported efforts under way and encouraged full-scale implementation of the rehabilitation programme as conditions permitted.

CHAPTER IX. FUTURE PROGRAMME OF WORK, INCLUDING FIELD VISITS TO TAKE PLACE IN THE SECOND HALF OF 1993

3. With regard to its future programme of work, the Committee decided to reconfirm the position reflected in paragraph 36 of document DP/1993/SCPM/L.1/Add.6 as its programme of work for the remainder of 1993 and 1994.

93-35446 (E) 170693

170693

UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1993/SCPM/L.3/Add.20
17 June 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME
MATTERS
Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE FORTIETH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 1-18 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Thomas STELZER (Austria)

Addendum

CHAPTER III. COUNTRY, INTERCOUNTRY AND GLOBAL PROGRAMMES (continued)

General discussion on country programmes

1. The Committee held a general discussion at the conclusion of its consideration of country programmes. The Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation, thanked delegations for their valuable comments on the fifth cycle country programmes. In summing up the discussions on the country programmes, he noted that donors, recipients and the secretariat had moved closer to a common interpretation of the guidelines contained in Governing Council decision 90/34 of 23 June 1990. However, he noted three issues on which he thought consensus had not yet been reached: the criteria for assessing whether a country programme was well-focused; the role of UNDP in aid coordination; and the question of conditionality in the use of UNDP resources.

Focusing country programmes

2. The Assistant Administrator noted that in their discussions of the fifth cycle country programmes, delegations had expressed the view that there should normally not be more than three to five areas of concentration in each country programme. That did not, however, easily translate into sectors and subsectors nor did it provide guidance on the total number of projects or activities that should be aimed at. For financial and administrative reasons, for example, a

programme with a focus on one subsector might still be divided into as many as 25 projects. Vested interests, long-established relationships and the maintenance of important goodwill continued to lead to a lack of focus.

3. Delegations commented that fifth cycle programmes seemed to be surprisingly similar in focus and questioned whether that was a true reflection of national priorities. They noted that the six areas of focus identified in Governing Council decision 90/34 might have contributed to the similarity. One delegation suggested the emphasis on the six areas of focus might need to be reviewed while another found the thematic comparison across programmes highly useful. One delegation regretted that gender had received only perfunctory treatment in the programmes, with little analysis of how to address the issue. Environment, on the other hand, had been well integrated.

4. The Assistant Administrator responded that the areas of focus were in fact problem areas common to most countries. They had therefore provided a realistic focus for fifth cycle programmes in the context of an overall focus on sustainable human development, and in accordance with Governing Council decision 90/34.

5. The representatives of the Regional Bureaux commented that a serious attempt had been made to focus programmes on the areas of focus identified by the Governing Council and to limit the length of the programme documents. Despite the apparent similarity in focus at the programme level, needs of countries varied at the subprogramme level. For example, there was a difference in the ways to achieve privatization in Africa and in the newly independent states of Eastern Europe.

Aid coordination

6. The Assistant Administrator noted that some good examples of the role of UNDP in assisting host Governments in aid coordination had been mentioned (in Bolivia and Pakistan) but doubts had also been expressed on the role of UNDP in that regard. The discussion had largely focused on coordination mechanisms such as round-table conferences and consultative group meetings, but the demand for day-to-day coordination in sectors and programmes was often even more important, particularly in developing the programme approach. The demand for coordination services varied from country to country and UNDP needed to outline those differences in order to lay down criteria for progress. UNDP intended to undertake further study of the demand for such coordination services to give a better picture of the potential and the limits of the role of UNDP. A report would be submitted to the Governing Council at its forty-first session (1994).

7. Delegations considered that coordination could be viewed on two levels: (a) coordination within the United Nations system to promote collaboration, with a motivating and facilitating role for UNDP; and (b) assistance to Governments to develop the capacity to use external resources more rationally. Success in coordination was attributed to a number of factors, including the Resident Coordinator's skill in team-building and the coordination capacity of the recipient country. It was proposed that UNDP examine the factors that contributed to success and continue to develop appropriate training and support for Resident Coordinators.

8. The representatives of the Regional Bureaux noted that while the personality of the Resident Coordinator played an important role in successful coordination efforts, the interest of the host country was also important, as was the cooperation of key bilateral donors.

Conditionality

9. The Assistant Administrator noted that questions had been raised on the appropriateness of UNDP imposing conditionality on the transfer of its resource. He stressed that the term had been created by the IMF to describe a negotiating situation that pertained specifically to the Fund's mode of operation. He pointed out that UNDP could not impose formal conditions on recipient countries. UNDP could only build on conditions related to effectiveness and impact rather than establish overall policy conditions that could hold the country programme in abeyance. The Administrator could refuse to release project funds if agreed counterpart inputs were not available. Under the programme approach, policy conditions related to the success of a specific programme might also be agreed to by the parties. This could lead to a redirection of resources to other programmes if the agreed policy environment was not in place. The Administrator could withhold formulation of the country programme as a whole only if some major disaster or breakdown occurred, as in the case of Somalia.

10. Several delegations cited the legislative basis for UNDP assistance and its emphasis on neutrality and flexibility to benefit recipient countries. They urged that political conditionality no longer be a feature in the approval of country programmes. The current trend was harmful to UNDP. On the other hand, it would be naive to expect assistance without some conditions pertaining to performance and need.

11. Other delegations pointed out the tension between conditionality and national sovereignty, stressing that the issue was one of accountability and approval by the Governing Council on how best to use resources. They cautioned against a return to the language of the 1970s and stressed that there was agreement that development policy in the 1990s must focus on people and that a strategy to that end would be successful if conditions were right, i.e., if the economic situation, political climate and social and human rights situation were conducive to programming. Moreover, the enabling environment should be adequate for the efficient implementation of UNDP programmes. Reliance on lessons learned and performance indicators could contribute to an assessment of the conditions needed for effective programming.

Other issues

Evaluation and feedback

12. Delegations observed that while the overall formulation of the country programmes was good, the assessment of lessons learned and constraints encountered had not been given adequate attention in most of the fifth cycle programmes. It was therefore difficult to determine whether tangible results had been achieved. There was too little focus on impact, possibly because of the lack of measurable performance indicators. There was a need to link evaluation more to planning and to develop further the necessary modalities.

Apparently too little time was devoted by the field office to in-depth analysis of experience and to the needs of the recipient countries. On the other hand, the image and visibility of UNDP had improved when the Organization played a role in analysis and information collection and dissemination.

13. The Assistant Administrator and representatives of the Regional Bureaux agreed that evaluation and feedback should be streamlined and become a more integral part of the culture of the Organization. As a result of new programming approaches, support cost arrangements and decentralization, the administrative workload of field offices needed to be reviewed in relation to the substantive analysis, information dissemination and coordination roles to be undertaken.

Other comments

14. Delegations welcomed efforts to include the participation of concerned country representatives in the presentations of the country programmes to the Committee. It was suggested that a summary table be prepared on the fifth cycle programmes showing approvals, extensions and dates of the mid-term reviews. The usefulness of the matrix on the six areas of focus in the country programmes was questioned and it was proposed to include information on the staffing of respective field offices. It was noted that while programme delivery was treated in detail in the programme support document, some information might also be included in the country programme document. The country programme document was becoming increasingly useful as a frame of reference for external use, as was the case for certain World Bank documents. The link between the advisory note for the country programme and the proposed country strategy note for United Nations system assistance needed to be explored. One delegation asked why the fifth cycle indicative planning figures (IPFs) for Latin America were so small. Another delegation said he had noticed a distinct style emerging in the programmes for different regions and wondered how much cross-over there was from one region to another, for example in terms of staffing. The optimal time for field visits was also raised.

15. In reply to several questions, it was noted that there was no optimal time given for field visits, in view of the rolling nature of programming. In Latin America, UNDP had evolved from a management function to a key partner in fund-raising. IPF resources for Latin America, allocated according to the general formula agreed to by the Governing Council, were increasingly being supplemented by cost-sharing that far exceeded core resources. Regional differences in approach to programming stemmed from the realities in the field as well as the general organizational culture. Country programme management plans were being further refined to provide better support to programming as it evolved. The Assistant Administrator and the representatives of the Regional Bureaux thanked delegations for their thought-provoking comments and in-depth interest in the fifth cycle programmes.